1	BEFORE THE					
2	ILLINOI	S COMMERCE COMMI	SSION			
3	ILLINOIS COMMERCE COM On Its Own Motion	MMISSION) DOCKET NO.) 10-0133			
4	-VS-)			
5	COMMONWEALTH EDISON (COMPANY)			
	Reconciliation of rev)			
6	collected under coal)			
	with prudent costs as	ssociated with)			
7	coal tar cleanup expe	enditures.)			
8						
		Springfield, I				
9		Wednesday, Jan	uary 26, 2011			
L O						
L1	Met, pursuant to	notice, at 10:0	0 a.m.			
	BEFORE:					
L2						
L3	MR. LARRY JONES,	Administrative	Law Judge			
	APPEARANCES:					
L4	MD MADY D TOTING	· OM				
L5	MR. MARK R. JOHNSON EIMER, STAHL, KLEVORN & SOLBERG LLP					
	224 South Michiga		1100			
L6	Chicago, Illinois Ph. (312) 660-760					
L7	PH. (312) 660-760	00				
L /		(Appearing via	teleconference	οn		
L8		behalf of Commo		OII		
- 0		Company)				
L9						
20						
21	SULLIVAN REPORTING C	OMPANY, by				
	Carla J. Boehl, Repor	-				
22	CSR #084-002710	-				

1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)					
2	MR. EUGENE BERNSTEIN EXELON BUSINESS SERVICES					
3	10 South Dearborn Street, 49th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60603					
4	Ph. (312) 394-7162 (Appearing via teleconference on					
5	behalf of Commonwealth Edison Company)					
6	MR. MIKE OSTRANDER					
7	Accounting Department Financial Analysis Division					
8	527 East Capitol Avenue Springfield, Illinois 62701					
9	Ph. (217) 557-1731					
10	(Appearing on behalf of Staff of the Illinois Commerce					
11	Commission)					
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						

1		IND	E X		
2			a= 0 a a		
3	WITNESS	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
4	(None)				
5					
6					
7					
8					
0					
9					
10					
11					
12		EXHIE	BITS		
13				MARKED	ADMITTED
13	ComEd 1.0			E-Docket	24
14	ComEd 2.0, 2.1			E-Docket	24
15	ComEd 3.0, 3.1, 3.2, ComEd 4.0, 4.1	3.3		E-Docket E-Docket	24 24
13	Comed 5.0			E-Docket	24
16	ComEd 6.0			E-Docket	24
	ComEd Group 1.0			E-Docket	24
17	ICC Staff 1.0, 1.1			E-Docket	25
19					
20					
21					
22					
<u> </u>					

1 PROCEEDINGS

- 2 JUDGE JONES: Good morning. I call for hearing
- 3 Docket Number 10-0133. This is titled in part
- 4 Commonwealth Edison Company, Reconciliation of
- 5 Revenues collected under coal tar riders with prudent
- 6 costs associated with coal tar clean-up expenditures.
- 7 We will start with taking appearances
- 8 for the record. If you have entered your appearance
- 9 previously at one of these hearings, you need not
- 10 spell your name or restate your business address or
- 11 phone number unless any of those things have changed
- or unless you simply prefer to. We will start with
- 13 appearances on behalf of Commonwealth Edison Company.
- 14 MR. JOHNSON: On behalf of Commonwealth Edison
- 15 Company, Mark R. Johnson with Eimer, Stahl, Klevorn
- 16 and Solberg, LLP.
- 17 MR. BERNSTEIN: And Eugene Bernstein of Exelon
- 18 Business Services Company.
- 19 JUDGE JONES: All right. Thank you.
- 20 Commission Staff?
- 21 MR. OSTRANDER: Mike Ostrander. I am appearing
- 22 on behalf of the Accounting Department of the

- 1 Financial Analysis Division for the Illinois Commerce
- 2 Commission.
- JUDGE JONES: Thank you. Are there any other
- 4 appearances?
- 5 (No response.)
- 6 Let the record show there are not, at
- 7 least at this time.
- 8 To provide a very brief opportunity to
- 9 go over the process for today's hearing, we hereby go
- 10 off the record.
- 11 (Whereupon there was then had an
- off-the-record discussion.)
- JUDGE JONES: Back on the record. There was an
- 14 off-the-record discussion for the purposes indicated.
- 15 It concerned the process and procedures for today's
- 16 hearing. There was also some brief discussion about
- 17 the procedural side of the Motion for Entry of a
- 18 Protective Order. There was also some discussion
- 19 about whether the record would be closed today or
- 20 left open.
- I think that the parties, starting
- with ComEd, are ready to proceed with the offering of

- 1 their testimony and exhibits, some of which will be
- 2 offered in two versions, the second version being a
- 3 proprietary version. And those items, evidentiary
- 4 items, will be offered via affidavit. Let me make
- 5 sure that that sequence works for everybody.
- Is that workable then for ComEd, to go
- 7 ahead and proceed with that task?
- 8 MR. JOHNSON: It is, Your Honor.
- 9 JUDGE JONES: So why don't you go ahead and
- 10 proceed with that?
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: Sure. ComEd moves for admission
- into evidence of the following exhibits:
- 13 The first is ComEd Exhibit 1.0, the
- 14 '09 Annual Report to the Illinois Commerce
- 15 Commission, Operation of Rider ECR, Environmental
- 16 Cost Recovery. This was filed February 26, 2010, on
- 17 e-Docket.
- 18 The second item is ComEd Exhibit 2.0
- 19 which is the direct testimony of Peter McCauley. It
- 20 includes Exhibit 2.1 and it was filed February 26,
- 21 2010, on e-Docket.
- The next is ComEd Exhibit 3.0 which is

- 1 the direct testimony of Kevin Waden. It includes
- 2 supporting exhibits 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. It was also
- 3 filed February 26, 2010, on e-Docket.
- The fourth item is ComEd Exhibit 4.0,
- 5 the rebuttal testimony of Kevin Waden. It includes
- 6 supporting Exhibit 4.1. It was filed December 15,
- 7 2010, on e-Docket.
- The fifth item is ComEd Exhibit 5.0.
- 9 This is the affidavit of Peter McCauley filed January
- 10 25, 2011, on e-Docket.
- The sixth item is ComEd Exhibit 6.0
- 12 which is the affidavit of Kevin Waden filed January
- 13 25, 2011, on e-Docket.
- 14 The final item is ComEd Group Exhibit
- 1.0 which is ComEd's responses to Staff's data
- 16 request FDR-1 through FDR-22 which was filed January
- 17 25, 2011, on e-Docket. And with respect to that
- 18 exhibit, because some of the data request responses
- 19 contain confidential and proprietary information, we
- 20 filed both a public version and a non-public
- 21 confidential and proprietary version for which we are
- 22 requesting confidential treatment of.

- 1 And with that, that concludes ComEd's
- 2 request for admission into evidence.
- JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Any
- 4 comments or objections to that?
- 5 MR. OSTRANDER: No, Your Honor.
- 6 JUDGE JONES: All right. Let the record show
- 7 that those exhibits are hereby admitted into the
- 8 evidentiary record. They are admitted as they appear
- 9 on the e-Docket system. The dates on which they were
- 10 filed were already stated by Mr. Johnson. I will not
- 11 repeat those at this time. As Mr. Johnson indicated,
- the documents admitted are ComEd Exhibits 1.0, 2.0,
- 13 2.1, 3.0, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.0, 4.1, 5.0, 6.0.
- 14 Also admitted are ComEd Group Exhibit
- 15 1.0. It is admitted in two versions, the public
- version, 1.0 Public, is admitted into the evidentiary
- 17 record. The confidential version, Group Exhibit 1
- 18 Confidential and Proprietary, is admitted into the
- 19 evidentiary record. It is afforded proprietary
- 20 treatment and will continue to be afforded
- 21 proprietary treatment by virtue of this ruling today
- 22 and by virtue of a written version of this ruling

- 1 which will be issued yet this week.
- 2 (Whereupon ComEd Exhibits 1.0,
- 3 2.0, 2.1, 3.0, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3,
- 4.0, 4.1, 5.0, 6.0 and Group
- 5 Exhibit 1.0 Public and
- 6 Confidential were admitted into
- 7 evidence.)
- 8 JUDGE JONES: Are there any questions or points
- 9 of clarification with regard to the admission or
- 10 status of any of the ComEd exhibits?
- 11 MR. JOHNSON: None from ComEd, Your Honor.
- 12 MR. OSTRANDER: None from Staff, Your Honor.
- 13 JUDGE JONES: Thank you. We will move ahead
- 14 then to the Staff filing. Mr. Ostrander, you are
- 15 going to offer yours via affidavit also, is that
- 16 correct?
- 17 MR. OSTRANDER: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 18 JUDGE JONES: All right. So we will not swear
- 19 you in since you are using the affidavit process.
- 20 But you can go ahead like Mr. Johnson did and
- 21 identify what it is you are offering.
- MR. OSTRANDER: Okay. Staff requests that the

- 1 following two exhibits be moved into the record of
- 2 evidence:
- 3 First is the direct testimony of Mike
- 4 Ostrander which is identified as ICC Staff Exhibit
- 5 1.0 and was filed on e-Docket on November 22, 2010.
- 6 It also contains one schedule identified as Schedule
- 7 1.01.
- 8 And, second, the affidavit of Mike
- 9 Ostrander identified as ICC Staff Exhibit 1.1 that
- 10 was filed on e-Docket on January 21, 2011.
- JUDGE JONES: Thank you. Are there any
- 12 objections or clarifications with regard to the items
- being offered by Mr. Ostrander?
- 14 MR. JOHNSON: ComEd has no objection.
- 15 JUDGE JONES: Let the record show that those
- 16 evidentiary items are admitted into the evidentiary
- 17 record as they appear on the e-Docket system on the
- 18 filing dates indicated by Mr. Ostrander. More
- 19 specifically, that's Staff Exhibits 1.0 and the
- 20 affidavit 1.1.
- 21 (Whereupon ICC Staff Exhibits
- 1.0 and 1.1 were admitted into

- 1 evidence.)
- JUDGE JONES: Before I forget, I believe the
- 3 parties are also going to be using some post-hearing
- 4 scheduling involving eventually the filing of a draft
- 5 Order. Mr. Johnson, what's the date for that and the
- 6 process?
- 7 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. So ComEd would propose
- 8 filing the draft Proposed Order on Friday, March 4,
- 9 2011. Prior to that, a week prior to that, we would
- 10 file a draft of that with Staff or at least provide a
- 11 copy of it to Staff a week prior for their review and
- 12 comment so we can incorporate their comments prior to
- 13 filing the final version on the 4th.
- 14 JUDGE JONES: Thank you. As indicated a couple
- of minutes ago, a ruling and/or protective order will
- 16 be issued later this week. It will afford
- 17 protection, that is proprietary treatment, to all the
- 18 proprietary, confidential and proprietary, items in
- 19 the confidential and proprietary version of ComEd
- 20 Group Exhibit Number 1. The confidential and
- 21 proprietary version is also sometimes referred to as
- the unredacted version. So by this ruling those

- 1 items are afforded proprietary treatment and
- 2 protection. The ruling to be issued later this week
- 3 will be essentially a written version of the oral
- 4 ruling today.
- In the event that ComEd and ComEd
- 6 counsel believe that there should be some
- 7 modification to that ruling to properly protect the
- 8 information, then ComEd is hereby given leave to make
- 9 a filing to seek modification of that ruling to cover
- 10 those concerns. Before leaving that topic, let me
- 11 make sure there are no other questions or need for
- 12 clarification with regard to it.
- 13 Is there any need for any
- 14 clarification with respect to the request for
- proprietary treatment, the process for that?
- 16 (No response.)
- 17 Okay. Let the record show no
- 18 response. So that is what we will do. And I think
- 19 the intent is to go ahead and close the record today
- 20 subject to any post-hearing filings that may be made.
- 21 One of those is the draft Order to be filed, but
- 22 another such item potentially would be a Motion to

- 1 Modify the Ruling regarding protection of proprietary
- 2 documents.
- I believe the plan is to go ahead and
- 4 close the evidentiary record today and mark the
- 5 record heard and taken, subject to the above, since
- 6 the evidentiary material will be in the record. So
- 7 is there any objection to the marking of this matter
- 8 heard and taken today subject to the above?
- 9 MR. JOJHNSON: No objection.
- 10 JUDGE JONES: Thank you. Is there anything
- 11 else to take up at this hearing today before we do
- 12 just that?
- 13 (No response.)
- 14 JUDGE JONES: Let the record show there is not.
- 15 At this time then let the record show that today's
- 16 hearing is over and in accordance with the above and
- 17 subject to the above, this hearing is hereby marked
- 18 heard and taken.
- 19 HEARD AND TAKEN

20

21

22